

To: Justic Zahid N. Quraishi

From: Albert Harshaw – Republican - US Senate Candidate NJ – US NAVY Veteran – Citizen,
acting Pro Se

Action Seeking Appeal to Morris County Republicans motion to clarify that the ruling did
not apply to Republicans

With respect to:

Case 3:24-cv-01098-ZNQ-TJB Document 195 Filed 03/29/24 Page 1 of 2 PageID: 3067

ANDY KIM in his personal capacity as a candidate for U.S. Senate, et al., Civil Action No. 24-
1098 (ZNQ) (TJB) ORDER Plaintiffs, v. CHRISTINE GIORDANO HANLON, et al., Defendants.

The late Saturday Ruling that the relief sought by Morris County Republicans, in that, the
ruling from Friday, found in favor of plaintiff Andy Kim that the county line was
unconstitutional; would not apply to the Republican Party Lines.

Respectfully Request,

I seek remedy, in that the original ruling, where found, unconstitutional, and immediate
enjoining of all counties to use only office grid balloting, be enforced, as the correct action,
as originally ordered for this cycle in the June 4th 2024 Primary Ballots.

Definitions:

- a) Entity – Morris County Republicans, and any other Republican organization, persons
affiliated with said Republican organizations, and any other county or state GOP
organization(s); and any persons or entities acting on behalf of said organization(s) -
to be all inclusive, not exclusive.
- b) People – people in this instance refers to a collection of individuals belonging to
a/the greater whole. People also include the state of citizenship.
- c) Citizen – for this purpose, is those individuals, people, belonging / affiliated to the
United States of America, and New Jersey protected by those Constitutions and
Laws.
- d) Individual – a person, actor of self-interest, yet not separate or apart from the state
of citizen, and enjoined to the Franchises guaranteed, In which, the Constitution so
supremely weighs too so jealousy.

Argument:

1. It cannot be made, so that, in ruling, that there are two classes of citizens created, when in fact there is only one, citizen(s) of the United States of America. Including in that, towards citizenry of state hood, there is also only one class of citizen as member of state: that is citizen(s). As in this case, the Democrat Party line is abolished, and the Republican Party Line is retained; That is the two classes created. As found and as ordered, that the party line is in fact unconstitutional, to be correct, simple Boolean logic states that, what is true on one side, is also true on the other side. Two opposite states cannot co-exist, in this instance, simultaneously. It is one or the other. Not both.
2. No entity, other than the self, can retain power and ownership of choice. No entity can exist that would usurp the individual choice. No entity, not chosen by the people, can be made to act as the people, when by that entities own charter functions to serve itself above the people, most especially, when not granted by the people.
3. While it is correct, to state that there are many case laws to state, that entities can and do exist, function, and operate as a person, it is in that legal framework also correct to state, that they exist as a person, functioning, and operating as a person, but not apart or above as a person, but as a part of the people, for the day to day operations. Not as a special class. Not separate, Not apart, but included. Therefore, there can be no exemption, because in this instance, this case, that entity, that organization, can have choice at the ballot, all the same as any other individual. This individual Albert Harshaw.

Examples:

1. No. 553 U.S. Leser v. Garnett 258 U.S. 130 (1922) • 42 S. Ct. 217 Decided Feb 27, 1922 - <https://www.njcourts.gov/attorneys/opinions/supreme>
2. Before addressing the merits of this case, we also consider plaintiffs' contention that the prior panel's decision, granting their request for preliminary injunctive relief, see *Hooks*, 121 F.3d 876, is the law of the case. The law of the case doctrine developed “to maintain consistency and avoid reconsideration of matters once decided during the course of a single continuing lawsuit.”
3. 14th Amendment Section 1: *All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.*
4. 1st Amendment
5. Due Process Clause under the 5th Amendment